

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

**DANIEL FORD,**

**Plaintiff,**

**V.**

**Warden TRACY JEFFERSON, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-19 (MTT)**

## ORDER

For the second time, Daniel Ford requests the appointment of counsel to represent him in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Doc. 76. Ford seeks counsel to assist him in his upcoming trial. *Id.* The “[a]ppointment of counsel in a civil case is not a constitutional right.” *Wahl v McIver*, 773 F.2d 1169, 1174 (11th Cir. 1986). Rather, it is a privilege justified only by exceptional circumstances. *Id.* In deciding whether counsel should be appointed, the Court considers, among other factors, the merits of the plaintiff’s claims and the complexity of the legal issues presented. *Holt v. Ford*, 862 F.2d 850, 853 (11th Cir. 1989). Considering those factors, the Court notes that Ford has set forth the essential factual allegations underlying his claim and that the applicable legal doctrines are readily apparent. Moreover, Ford has proven to be capable of filing motions, making competent arguments, and obtaining relevant documents without help from an attorney. See Docs. 47; 54; 72; 76. Accordingly, Ford’s motion to appoint counsel (Doc. 76) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 22nd of October, 2024.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT